

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 16-18 are added. No new matter has been added.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has raised new grounds of rejection in the outstanding Office Action and the outstanding Office Action has prematurely been made final. For example, in paragraph 5, on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has presented a new ground of rejection by asserting that U.S. Patent No. 5,859,415 to Blomqvist et al. (Blomqvist) now teaches a computer unit 11 that is alleged to be equivalent to the control apparatus as recited in claim 1. However, in the previous Office Action dated February 18, 2005, the Examiner did not make this assertion, but instead, asserted that camera 10 of Blomqvist was equivalent to the control apparatus as recited in claim 1. Because the Examiner has introduced a new ground of rejection in the current outstanding Office Action, that was not in reply to Applicant's claim amendments, only a dependent claim being amended in the preceding reply, the Final Rejection is premature.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Patel in the May 24, 2005 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

As there are no claim amendments, entry is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because:

(a) the application is in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; and (b) the dependent claims added do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration.

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Blomqvist et al. ("Blomqvist"), U.S. Patent No. 5,859,415. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action's assertions that Blomqvist discloses: (1) a control apparatus including a storage unit including a table storing

identification information assigned to the control apparatus and identification information of another control apparatus as in independent claim 1, (2) a control system including a first storage unit for storing the identification information of a control apparatus's own and the identification information of the other control apparatuses to which registration update information is added in a table of a control the apparatus's own as in independent claim 2, and (3) a control system including a first transmission unit of a first control apparatus transmitting identification information of the first control apparatus to a second control apparatus, the first transmission unit of the second control apparatus transmitting identification information of the second control apparatus to the first control apparatus, as well as the reception units and first storage units of the first and second control apparatus of independent claim 9.

Contrary to the Office Action assertion, the camera 10 of Blomqvist does not correspond to Applicant's control apparatus as recited in claim 1. In Blomqvist, we do not know if camera 10 includes a storage unit having a table storing identification information assigned to the control apparatus (camera 10) and identification information of another control apparatus (e.g., another camera 10) because Blomqvist is silent as to the configuration of camera 10. Further, the Office Action has failed to point out with specificity where in the disclosure of Blomqvist it states that camera 10 includes a storage unit. Accordingly, Blomqvist fails to disclose each and every feature as recited in claim 1 and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is inappropriate.

Also contrary to the Office Action assertion, the cameras 10 of Blomqvist do not correspond to the control apparatuses as recited in claims 2 and 9. For example, the Office Action alleges that transponder 13 and intelligent card 14 of Blomqvist correspond to the first transmission unit, that the transmitter and receiver unit 7 of Blomqvist corresponds to the reception unit, and that the vehicle 4 corresponds to the first storage unit, as recited in claims 2 and 9. However, the Office Action fails to point out with specificity where in the disclosure

of Blomqvist it teaches that the camera 10 includes the first transmission unit, the reception unit, and the storage unit. As clearly recited in claims 2 and 9, each of the control apparatuses includes the first transmission unit, the reception unit, and the storage unit. However, as clearly shown in Figs. 1-2 of Blomqvist, the transponder 13, intelligent card 14, transmitter and receiver unit 7, and vehicle 4 are all clearly separate and distinct members and are not part of camera 10. Therefore, camera 10 cannot possibly include these independent and distinct members.

Additionally, because the Office Action has asserted that the identification information as recited in claims 2 and 9 correspond to identification information of the intelligent card 14 and identification information of vehicle 4 of Blomqvist, and that the cameras 10 of Blomqvist correspond to Applicant's control apparatuses, the identification information of Applicant's control apparatus cannot correspond to the intelligent card 14 and identification information of the vehicle 4 as taught in Blomqvist because intelligent card 14 and identification information of the vehicle 4 do not correspond to the identification information of the cameras 10.

Applicant also respectfully disagrees with the Office Action's assertion that Blomqvist discloses "a plurality of control apparatus connected to each other to communicate with each other such as cameras connected to each other with transmitter and receiver equipment for communicating with cameras and central processing unit or central office through computer for communication among one another and controlling camera and toll facility . . ." (emphasis added). Blomqvist does not teach that any camera is a "control apparatus," that any cameras are "connected to each other," that any camera has "transmitter and receiver equipment for communicating with cameras," and that any control is exercised over any camera by any "control apparatus." The portions of Blomqvist identified in the Office Action do not disclose these features expressly or by implication.

The cameras disclosed in Blomqvist are of the standard type, with no disclosed features that make the Blomqvist cameras "control apparatus." Blomqvist discloses cameras that are capable of only collecting video images in a standard fashion, with no disclosure of any control-related features, the ability to control any other camera or device, or any other feature that would make a Blomqvist camera a "control apparatus." See Blomqvist at column 7, lines 32-34. Blomqvist does not disclose a camera capable of "controlling cameras and toll facility," as asserted in the Office Action, because each Blomqvist camera provides only a video image to computer unit 11, and there is no disclosure of any control signal being provided by a camera to any other camera or to a "toll facility." See Blomqvist at column 3, lines 4-13. Blomqvist also does not disclose cameras capable of being controlled by other cameras or by any other device, as each Blomqvist camera is mounted onto gantry 1 and directed at a single predetermined point to cover a traffic lane or the verge of a road. See Blomqvist at column 2, lines 25-35. The Blomqvist cameras are not disclosed to be movable or otherwise adjustable and, furthermore, and subsequent processing of the video images obtained by the Blomqvist cameras is conducted at computer unit 11 or at other, non-camera, equipment. See Blomqvist at column 3, lines 4-13 and column 7, lines 32-45. The Blomqvist cameras are therefore not a plurality of control apparatuses.

In addition to the above, Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action's allegation that "the Blomqvist reference teaches that cameras are provided for controll[] by the toll facility such as a lower level, cameras directed forwards and backwards and controlled for approaching traffic flow to register vehicles which unpermittedly are driven on the verge for identifying and forwarding the information to toll facility for processing and collecting toll." Applicant submits that merely receiving a signal from a video camera, as disclosed in Blomqvist, is not equivalent to exercising control over the camera. The Blomqvist cameras do not perform any of the functions described in the Office Action, i.e., "controlled for

approaching traffic flow to register vehicles . . . for identifying and forwarding the information to toll facility . . ." (emphasis added). Rather, such registration, identification, and forwarding functions are not performed by cameras, but are instead performed by other devices, such as "a mass storing memory in the computer systems," "a video recorder or on a data disc," and computer unit 11. See Blomqvist at column 2, lines 54-67; column 3, lines 1-13; column 5, lines 21-34; and column 7, lines 32-53. The Blomqvist cameras are therefore not control apparatuses.

The Blomqvist cameras also are not connected to each other and there is no teaching that any Blomqvist camera has "transmitter and receiver equipment for communicating with other cameras." Each camera disclosed in Blomqvist is directly connected only to computer unit 11. See Blomqvist at column 3, lines 2-8; Figures 1 and 2. As shown in Blomqvist at Figure 1, cameras 8, 9, and 10 are connected solely to computer unit 11 and not to any other device or camera. Furthermore, there is no disclosure in Blomqvist of any camera having "transmitter and receiver equipment for communicating with other cameras." The Blomqvist cameras are thus not connected to each other to communicate with each other.

Applicant also respectfully disagrees with the Office Action's assertion that the Blomqvist cameras transmit or receive identification information, as recited in claims 1, 2, and 9. As stated above, Blomqvist does not disclose or suggest cameras that are connected to or capable of communicating with each other, as each camera is connected only to computer unit 11. See Blomqvist at column 3, lines 2-8; Figures 1 and 2. Blomqvist also does not disclose the transmission or receipt of identification information from or to any camera. The Blomqvist cameras are of the standard type and only capable of collecting video images in a standard fashion. See Blomqvist at column 7, lines 32-34.

In the personal interview of May 24, 2005, the Examiner alleged that Blomqvist discloses (1) that the transponder 13 or intelligent card 14 could be used to lift the gate of a

toll booth, and that these devices provide a control function and (2) a computer unit 11 that contains its own identification information as well as the identification information of the intelligent card 14.

Applicant respectfully submits that Blomqvist does not teach or suggest a gate of a toll booth or the lifting of a gate of a toll booth using the transponder 13 or the intelligent card 14. Blomqvist discloses a computer 11 which provides controls and processing of recorded data. In Blomqvist, there are no controllers with associated identification data. Blomqvist discloses a transponder 13 and an intelligent card 14 which transmits data via transponder in addition to certain identification data. See, e.g., Blomqvist at column 2, lines 45-53. The transponder and the intelligent card are not control apparatuses. As discussed in the specification, for example, at page 12, line 8, et seq., the control apparatus may output a control signal for driving various actuators. The transponder and intelligent card of Blomqvist are passive devices. Accordingly, the Blomqvist system does not provide a control function, as alleged by the Examiner.

Blomqvist also does not disclose that computer unit 11 would contain its own identification information as well as the identification information of intelligent card 14, as alleged by the Examiner at the May 24 interview. At most, the only identification information potentially transmitted by the Blomqvist apparatus is from a smart card in the vehicle 4 to the computer 11 via the transmitter receiver equipment 7. In that process, the identity of the vehicle is provided to the unit 11, but the identity of the unit is not provided to the vehicle. The communication of identification information is, therefore, uni-directional and not between two different control apparatuses as required by claims 1, 2, and 9. Applicant maintains that, despite the Examiner's arguments to the contrary, Blomqvist does not detail how the computer unit 11 communicates with the intelligent card 14 or to transponder 13. Accordingly, Blomqvist does not teach or suggest "a storage unit including a

table storing identification information assigned to the control apparatus and identification information of another control apparatus," as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 2 and 9.

In view of the foregoing, Blomqvist fails to disclose all of the features recited in independent claims 1, 2, and 9 as well as the additional features recited in the dependent claims thereof. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kurt P. Goudy
Registration No. 52,954

JAO:KPG/tea

Date: December 23, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--